

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
S. PETER LUDWIG
DARBY & DARBY
P.O. BOX 5257
NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

MLC

<div style="font-size: 1.2em; font-family: cursive;">06727/2201475-600</div>		Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 04 FEB 2004
Applicant's or agent's file reference 50036		REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/IL03/00966	International filing date (day/month/year) 13 November 2003 (13.11.2003)	Priority date (day/month/year) 14 November 2002 (14.11.2002)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC: A61N 1/08 (2006.01) USPC: 607/46		
Applicant BRAINSGATE LTD		

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Basis of the opinion
II	<input type="checkbox"/>	Priority
III	<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
IV	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of unity of invention
V	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
VI	<input type="checkbox"/>	Certain documents cited
VII	<input type="checkbox"/>	Certain defects in the international application
VIII	<input type="checkbox"/>	Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When?	See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).
How?	By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.
Also	For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 14 March 2005 (14.03.2005)

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201	Authorized officer <div style="font-family: cursive; font-size: 1.2em;">Tuan V. Nguyen</div> Telephone No. 571-272-5962
---	---

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/IL03/00966

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>15-24, 31, 40, 44-45 and 47-64</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-4, 5-14, 25-30, 32-39, 41-43 and 46</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-64</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-64</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-4, 5-14, 25-30, 32-39, 41-43 and 46 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Ansarinia (US 6,526,318). Ansarinia discloses an apparatus for treating a subject, comprising: an stimulation device, adapted to be implanted in a vicinity of a site selected from the list consisting of: a sphenopalatine ganglion (SPG) of the subject and a neural tract originating in or leading to the (SPG) and a connecting element, coupled to the stimulation device and adapted to be passed through at least a portion of a greater palatine canal of the subject (see Figures 1-23 and entire document).

Claims 15-24, 31, 40, 44-45 and 47-64 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Ansarinia (US 6,526,318) in view of Edwards et al. (US 5,514,131). Ansarinia discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the step of bringing the device into contact comprises: applying stimulation with the device, observing one or more physiological responses of the subject to the stimulation, and verifying desired placement of the device responsive to the observation and the steps as claimed by the applicant in claims 49-64. However, Ansarinia as modified by Edwards discloses all the limitations as claimed by the applicant.

Claims 1-64 the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/IL03/00966

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 pages 1-31, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the claims:
 pages 32-39, as originally filed
 pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the drawings:
 pages 13, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
 pages NONE, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☒ the description, pages NONE _____
- ☒ the claims, Nos. NONE _____
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE _____

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/IL03/00966

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended, 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.